THE

HERALD OF TRUTH.

And HE that sat upon the throne said, 'BEHOLD I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW." Rev. xxi, 5.

VOL. I. FEBRUARY 9, 1826. No. 20.

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

—

[Some years ago, Mr. Robert Hindmarsh published a work entitled, "*A seal on the lips of Unitarians, Trinitarians and all such as deny the sole Supreme and exclusive divinity of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*" A member of the Episcopal Church in Steubenville, O. requested of Mr. Grant, the author of this communication, the privilege of reading the above work, which he returned with some strictures of his own; in answer to which strictures, the following letter was written,]

—

SIR—

As to your abundant acknowledgments for the perusal of Mr. Hindmarsh's "*Seal on the lips*," I have only to say that it is a duty incumbent on every believer of the New Dispensation, not to put the candle under a bushel. But I am not disappointed that you were not pleased or benefited by it, as it appears you were predetermined at any rate, to quarrel with the author. For I am credibly informed that before you began to read, you had resolved to send me several sheets of the inconsistencies contained in that work. Being thus determined to condemn before trial, we are not surprised that you cannot subscribe to the doctrines therein contained, for none are so deaf as those who will not hear. But amongst all your objections, you have adduced no evidence from scripture to prove these doctrines antichristian or false. And it appears that you were in some measure disappointed yourself, since instead of several you have sent even less than one half sheet. And that too, consisting of mutilated quotations, evidently with the intention to draw forced constructions and inferences dimetrically opposite to the meaning and even expression of the author. And not content with this, you even put words into his mouth, as may be seen in what follows: "*The Father or Divinity being in himself invisible*

or inconceivable by any effort of the human mind, is therefore no object of thought, no object of love, no object of religious worship." This quotation is incorrect, and the sentence in the original reads thus: "Whereas the Father or Divinity, out of or separate from the Humanity, being in himself invisible, or inconceivable by any effort of the human mind, is therefore no object of thought, no object of love, and consequently no object of *rational* worship."

In objecting to the above, you are not only combating this writer, but the doctrines and worship of your own Church, as it is acknowledged therein, that "God out of Christ is a consuming fire." And Luther says, "that it is Hellish and Devilish to attempt to worship the Father out of Christ." Your church therefore worship and pray to the Father through the Son, and for his sake. Also in the word it is written, "no man shall see his face and live." The Mount was fenced lest the children of Israel should approach and die. Also the children of Israel could not behold the face of Moses after speaking with the Lord, until he veiled it. "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape." "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." "No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him." "No man cometh to the Father but by me. I am the door; by me if any man enter, &c. But whosoever entereth not by the door, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." That is, he who approacheth the Father, out of the Son, robbeth the Son of his Divinity. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. vi. 9. From the above, with many other passages that might be cited, it is evident what the case would be with man, did he approach the naked Divinity without a mediator or medium of conjunction. As well might the sun cause the earth to vegetate without intermediate atmospheres and not consume it, as the naked Divinity approach men or devils without consuming them.

"*The idea of the divine omnipresence can only be obtained by removing from the mind every consideration of space as well as time; then it may be seen that God is omnipresent without having any relation whatever to space or time, or in any way commixing himself with them. He must ever be regarded as a whole and complete God, being every where alike present with his fulness, however imperceptible or incomprehensible it may be to the creature.*" Here again you have not brought forward the passage entire, but have omitted in your quotation what is acknowled in all the schools in Christendom: viz. That the Divine Essence is indivisible. You have also omitted the following observation of this author, viz. "*That if the divine omnipresence consisted in extension as to space, one part must be here and another part there; in which case he could not be omnipresent, since omnipresence must consist in his being present every where in all his fulness. And therefore, if there be three or three thousand persons in the Godhead, by parity of reasoning there would*

be limited location." You also adduce the following remark of the author: "*Such and so great is the difference between the worship of those who profess to believe in an invisible Deity, and the worship of those who acknowledge God in the form of man, not a material man, subject to limitation of time or space, but a divinely substantial man, omnipresent in all space without space, and in all time without time.*"

You then go on to observe: "In the first of these quotations it is roundly asserted, that a Divinity, invisible, and inconceivable by the human mind, is no object of thought, of love, or of *religious* worship. In the second it is fairly admitted that God, who is every where present in all his fulness, is imperceptible and incomprehensible to the creature. In the third, Jesus Christ is implied to be God, in the form of a man, not subject to limitation of time and space. If he be so, he must be imperceptible and incomprehensible to the creature; consequently he must be invisible and inconceivable by any effort of the human mind, (for how can the human mind see that which is imperceptible, or conceive that which is inconceivable;) agreeable thereto, the principle laid down in the first quotation, Jesus Christ "is no object of thought, no object of love, no object of religious worship." Here I must remark that in your third quotation you have omitted the words "*Supreme Ens, pervading the Universe, and not co-extended with it.*" Your reason for this omission is obvious, viz. the words omitted, being demonstrative of your faith in the unknown God whom ye ignorantly worship, him declare we unto you. Against which declarations I am sorry to say, your criticisms are levelled.

In your remark on your second quotation, you artfully put the masculine gender for the neuter, as the author is not speaking of the divine humanity in the paragraph alluded to, but of the divine omnipresence, however incomprehensible and inconceivable it may be.

In your comments upon the quotation you suppose that if the Lord in his divine humanity is unlimited by time and space, he can be no object of love, worship, or adoration, and that the human mind cannot conceive or comprehend any thing out of time and space. If this be the case, the written word can be of little use to man, for it abundantly treats of many things not prescribed by time and space, and therefore the minds of those, who cannot comprehend or conceive any thing above time or space, or in other words above the bodily senses, must be like those of idiots or madmen. That the Lord is in time without time, and in space without space, or in other words, that though he pervades and governs time and space, yet there is no space in his immensity, nor time in his eternity. For as he created both space and time he must have been before them, as you can easily perceive, unless you are a materialist and would have matter to be eternal.—Some light may be obtained on this subject from the consideration that although the soul of man exists in the human form, yet it occupies no space. That the soul exists in the human form is evident from the circumstance that Moses and Elias were seen in that form at the

transfiguration. The same also was the case with the angel who talked with John, and neither of these according to your own creed had yet resumed the natural body.

That the soul occupies no space is demonstrated from its mode of existence in the material body. It being the life of the body, it must be in every part thereof; for however materialists may differ as to the place of the soul's residence in the body, it is evident that it must be in every part thereof, otherwise the body could not be all animated. And although the soul exists within the space of the body, whilst the body is alive, yet it occupies no space, for the nicest anatomists can discover no vacuum in the body after its departure. If it be true then, that the human soul occupies no space in the human body even in this life, how much more must it be true that the infinite Divine Humanity can be subject to no limitation of either time or space.—And again though the soul of man be finite, yet it can survey not only the material world, but the spiritual also. And the sun of this world, though a local and material body, can through the instrumentality of its light and heat cause all the earths in the solar system to vegetate. How much more is the infinite Divine Humanity, though in human form, in his infinite love, wisdom, and power, able to pervade and govern the universe. Let all material and visible objects be removed, together with the earth, the sun and moon, and what could be predicated of time and space? Hence, therefore it must be evident to every rational mind, that the spirit of man, the spiritual world, and the Lord, cannot be prescribed by material objects. And as for the incomprehensibility of the Divine Humanity which you would palm upon this author, we are obliged to conclude that it was not him that you were consulting, but the Athenasian creed, which makes the Father and Son alike incomprehensible, notwithstanding the Son was manifested in the flesh and the Father was not, agreeable to your own creed. But if the Father and Son are alike incomprehensible (which no writer of the New Church asserts) what becomes of the man Christ Jesus, agreeable to Paul? That the Lord is a divine man is evident from this that he ascended into Heaven from the grave with his body complete, unless it should be supposed that he ejected it after his ascension, which none have attempted to assert. And also, that there can be no essence without a form, nor form without an essence, unless you can suppose a cause without an effect, or an effect without a cause. And again, there can be no substance without a form, or form without a substance, unless you can separate cause and effect. And to suppose the Lord not to be substance and form, and yet to have created substances and forms, would be making the effect greater than the cause, an idea so derogatory to revelation and sound philosophy as not to be admitted for a moment. For the heavenly principles of love and wisdom are only to be found in the divine person of our Lord, in good men, and in angels: and the hellish principles of evil nd the false are to be found only in evil men and devils, other-

wise these opposite principles must be floating about in the air, or in the bowels of the earth: an idea too ridiculous to be admitted. Why then sir, do you attempt to vindicate, or worship with the Deist and Unitarian a God without body or parts, a globular vapour co-extended with space, and which in reality is nothing more than naturalism.—We are not surprised then, that you should deny the omnipresence of the Lord Jesus Christ, although in so doing you also deny his divinity, which it appears you find little or no difficulty in doing. While you therefore pay your adorations to an unknown God who has neither substance or form, and consequently is nothing; the members of the New Jerusalem worship the Lord Jesus Christ in his divine humanity, and in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the god-head bodily. I have dwelt longer on this subject than I first intended, in consequence of a former unprovoked attack from you, in which, endeavoring to prove your hypothesis of God not being substance or form, you asserted that light was neither substance or form, in contradiction to the best modern philosophers who have amply demonstrated the rays of light to be composed of particles of globular form. But the form of God can be abundantly proven from the word, for in every representation and manifestation of him therein contained he is described in the human form. Then whence that fatal error which pervades the church at this day, that God is neither substance or form? Not from the word. We admit that it is written that he is a spirit, yet it is in the false notion which the natural man entertains, with respect to spirit as of a volatile vapour, that this error is founded. But alas! sir, what communication can we have with, or what influence can this attenuated vapour have upon us, save on our lungs; for it cannot possibly be an object of love, worship, or adoration.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

[*In all ages of the Christian Church, there have been pious, enlightened and good men, who were enabled to discover in the word of God, treasures of heavenly wisdom; they could look through the letter into the spirit. Whilst many confine their views to the mere literal sense, these men extended their views to the internal sense. Whilst others believed the word to treat alone of natural and earthly things, these men could find spiritual and heavenly subjects revealed and explained. The two following extracts, on the subject of the forbidden fruit, were written by members of the Society of Friends. The first is taken from a work of Thomas Maule, printed* 1695.]

CONCERNING THE WONDERFUL AND MYSTERIOUS TREES IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN. p. 220.

"Now *some* will have the *tree* of *knowledge* of good and evil, to be a *natural tree*, planted by God in Paradise; with whom I will not much contend, but of such a nature it was, that whosoever did eat thereof

should have their eyes opened against themselves, and so be as Gods, to know both good and evil: then might it be, that God would admonish Adam both *inwardly* and *outwardly*, of what he did *inwardly*, and in his heart, either forbid or teach, that he would likewise, for the greater evidence set before his eyes. But withal this may be granted, that what was *outwardly* done, the *same* happened *inwardly* in the *heart* of Adam, that he was *there* tempted by the seed of the serpent, viz: to make some account and reckoning of his *own wisdom, will*, and *nature*, and not submit himself unto God, as void of all name, knowledge, or work, but to be something of himself. And there are two causes for it, first, because the promise is, that 'the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent.' Now I do not read of any *natural* or *living* serpent, whose head was so bruised by the *seed* of the woman; therefore it may be said, as the *spiritual seed* of the woman (or Christ) was in the *heart* of Adam, so likewise was the *serpent's* seed; for man was made good, and not of the substance of God, therefore it is that man turns himself always from God, and inclineth to his own vanity: for what is the *devil, sin, death and hell, but nothing*, even as many of the fathers have wrote, especially *Thaulerus*, that God never *created* them, for they are a *non-entity*, a *not-being*, which is perfectly opposite to *entity* and *being*; and this might be the *devil* that dwelt in Adam which seduced him, as also in Lucifer. The other cause is this, that the scriptures likewise witness, that the city of God, and the heavenly Jerusalem, and the kingdom of God, is a *paradise within his people;* and further that God and his almighty word is their paradise, the tree of life, the temple, where they dwell, walk, sacrifice and pray, as likewise are his people and paradise: and that the beasts spoken of in the Revelations, which the whole world, both great and small, do at this day worship in their hearts, as likewise the tree of knowledge of good and evil is within men."—

"To this interpretation agreeth *true divinity*, that *this tree* in the *substance* thereof is *nothing else* but *man's own will* and *knowledge*, of which alone in all the earthly paradise of this wide world of men's hearts, they ought not to eat, but to account it forbidden except they will eat of death and destruction. For as soon as Adam fell, by eating of *this tree*, the tree was *immediately* planted in his *mind*, and afterwards derived into all the branches and fruit thereof, so that as the same word, precept, and forbidding was commanded to all, so is the same fall, all men which are in Adam, have now eaten of death, and received from the serpent this undigested poison. So that it is easily perceived how man is his own greatest enemy, and what he ought to think of himself, of his own will, understanding, wisdom and knowledge, seeing it is the council, seed, wisdom, knowledge, and head of the serpent, which must by Christ, be bruised in the children of men."

"What is it that men think is the beast of which Daniel writeth, that 'resisteth and blasphemeth the most high, and killeth the saints?' Is it not that old serpent that overthrew Adam and Eve? And what is the tree of knowledge of good and evil? What is the shameless king

and antichrist of which Daniel wrote, and Paul to the Thessalonians? And what is that many headed beast which the whole world adoreth, which is spoken of in the Revelations? And what is *sin?* What is *death?* What is the *devil* himself, but every man's *own will, wisdom, reason, religion, righteousness, skill, delight,* for which cause, Paul calleth it 'death itself,' 'enmity against God,' and 'folly before him,' and the apostle James calls it, 'earthly,' 'human,' 'devilish wisdom,' because these three are one and the same."

"And many are they that talk of his [Adam's] eating, and pretend to detest it, and him for it, yet *themselves* eat of it, even as *he* hath done, which doth manifest the miserable state of men, who prepare a rod for themselves, by giving sentence against their own life, by condemning their first father Adam, and perceive not *themselves* fast in the same trap. Here then consider diligently, what man's will, knowledge and understanding is, where they think they may come into the presence of God; whereas indeed it is nothing but the bitterness of death, and the fruit of the forbidden tree; how few are there among men that perceive this, or will learn to put off, deny, fear, mortify or kill his own will and wisdom? Nay, rather do they not hold it fast, extol and value it as fine gold? When indeed it is eternal death; and truly in this misery the whole world lieth sick, and few is the number of those blessed ones, who are delivered from themselves, and their own wills, power and wisdom, but are a small remnant, and few in number, 'as one of a city, and two of a tribe,' that find this straight gate, and enter in at it."—

OF THE SERPENT AND FORBIDDEN FRUIT—*By G. Whitehead*, 1661.

"Also the priests' *ignorance* and *darkness* hath appeared, who have affirmed that the *forbidden fruit* which the serpent tempted Eve to eat of, was *an apple.* From which dream of theirs the picture of a snake and an apple in its mouth in a tree, with the image of a man and a woman are set up at the beginning of bibles, and in many other places, from which some have imagined that the *serpent* which *beguiled Eve* was a *visible creature* or beast of the field, which for that time had power to speak and present an apple to deceive Eve withal; when as God said to man and woman before the fall, "behold I have given you every herb bearing seed that is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, to you it shall be for meat." Gen. i. 29. And the fruit of such a tree that beareth seed is an apple; so that could not be the forbidden fruit. And the serpent was that which tempted man from the simplicity of the truth, and through subtility led him out from innocency and life, (wherein God had placed him) to feed upon the fruit of the tree of knowledge, which was desirable to the carnal or woman's part that was not content with the pure, innocent and simple being, wherein God at first placed man over the rest of the creation, and wherein he was more peculiar and near to the Lord than the other creatures, and might

have fed upon the tree of life which was above the serpent and his subtility, and beyond that knowledge of good and evil which that got into, which went out from the life of truth and innocency: and which let in the temptation and subtility that betrayed the simplicity in man, and brought on the enmity, disobedience, and misery, which caused the curse to come upon him. And when the enmity and disobedience was entered into the devil, who before was called the serpent, who abode not in the truth, and which God for his rebellion, cursed, and said, "upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat," he got power over the creature and ruleth the children of disobedience. And of this serpent who beguiled Eve the apostle was jealous lest that the Corinthians should be deceived by him, and their minds corrupted and led away through his subtility, from the simplicity of the gospel which was in Christ." 2 Cor. ii. 2, 3.

***The Editor has not the works from which the above extracts were taken, but is indebted for them to the BEREAN, a very valuable periodical work, published at Wilmington, Delaware.

[The following short extract from the Apocalypse explained No. 1206, by Emanuel Swedenborg, is deserving the attention of every rational being.]

That nothing in nature existeth except from a spiritual [principle,] and by it. The reason is, because nothing can exist except from another, and so lastly from Him, who is and exists in Himself, who is God, whence also God is called esse and existere, Jah from esse, and Jehovah from esse and existere in Himself. The reason why nothing exists in nature but from a spiritual principle, is because there cannot any thing be given, unless it hath a soul, all that being called soul which is essence, for what hath not in itself an essence, this doth not exist, for it is a non-entity, because there is no esse or being as the ground of existence: thus it is with nature; its essence from which it exists is the spiritual principle, because this hath in itself the divine esse, and also the divine power of acting, creating, and forming, as will be seen from what follows; this essence may also be called soul, inasmuch as all that is spiritual liveth, and what is alive, when it acteth into what is not alive, as into what is natural, causeth it either to have as it were life, or to derive somewhat of the appearance thereof from the living principle: the latter is the case in vegetables, the former in animals.—That nothing in nature existeth but from a spiritual principle, is evident also from this consideration, that no effect is given without a cause, and whatever existeth in effect is from a cause; what is not from a cause is separated: thus it is with nature; the singular and most singular things thereof are an effect from a cause which is prior to it,

also interior and superior to it, and which is immediately from God: for there exists a spiritual world, which is prior, interior and superior to the natural world, wherefore every thing of the spiritual world is a cause, and every thing of the natural world is an effect. There is indeed an existence of one thing from another by progression even in the natural world also, but this by causes from the spiritual world, for where the cause of the effect is, there also is the cause of the effect efficient; for every effect becomes an efficient cause in order even to the ultimate, where the effective power subsists, but this is effected continually from a spiritual [principle,] in which alone that force is: this therefore is what is meant when it is said that nothing in nature exists except from a spiritual [principle,] and *by it*. There are two mediate causes in nature by which every effect or production and formation there is produced: these mediate causes are light and heat: the light modifies substances, and the heat actuates them; each is from the presence of the sun in them: the presence of the sun which appears as light, causes the activity of the forces or substances of every individual thing according to the form in which it is from creation; this is modification: but the presence of the sun which is perceived as heat, expandeth all things, and produceth the power of acting and effecting according to their form, by actuating the conatus or effort in which they are from creation; the conatus, which by means of heat becomes an active power even in the most minute forms of nature, is from the spiritual [principle] acting in them and into them.

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

Mr. Editor.

It is now more than sixty years since the commencement of the New Church, and it is still small, very small indeed in comparison with other churches, such as the Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, &c. &c. If it is the real truth, why does it not gain the ascendency? Why do not all people see its truths and flock to it for instruction? Indeed why do not all mankind become New Jerusalemites at once? Indeed, why did not Baron Swedenborg, and why do not his followers, one and all, work such astonishing and wonderful miracles, that every body would be irresistibly convinced that such extraordinary power could be derived from no source but God himself? And why are not all the members of the New Church a thousand times more wise, learned, and better than other people? And particularly why are not all your preachers the greatest and wisest men of all nations, and above all things why are they not the greatest orators in the world? And why do not the learned and the great all join your

church, such in this country as Presidents, Judges, Governors, members of the general and state governments, &c. &c? Or in other words if the New Church is the true church why would it not be reasonable to suppose that the Lord would call all the above descriptions of men into its service? But instead of any thing like this, we find nearly all the societies of your church very small and poor, and few indeed of the members can boast of either money, learning or popularity. And prejudice is so strong against it, that it requires pretty good courage in any person to attend your meeting as often as three times a year. And there is another strange thing about your church, and in which it differs from all others unless it be the Quakers, and that is we never hear of any revivals of religion amongst you. But among the Presbyterians, Baptists, &c. these things frequently happen. It is common for persons amongst them to be taken very serious, or under concern as they call it, and which lasts from four to eight weeks when they receive comfort, are considered religious people, and are received into the church. The Methodists are more expeditious still, they will transform the vilest wretches in existence, at one camp meeting or in one night, into what they would call good orthodox christians, and this is not done with here and there a solitary one, but by hundreds, and I might almost say by thousands. But I never hear any thing like this of the New Church. If I mistake not Emanuel Swedenborg and John Wesley were cotemporaries, but the followers of the former even at this day are very few, while those of the latter are very numerous. Now Mr. Editor, if you, or some of your correspondents will explain all these difficulties, you will confer a favor on HORATIO.

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

Mr. Editor—

In the twenty-seventh chapter of Genesis it appears according to the literal sense, that Jacob deceived his father, and thus by fraud and falsehood obtained the blessing that was intended for his brother.—But no where is this conduct imputed to him as a crime, nor does it in any place appear to be condemned by the Lord. An explanation of this interesting subject would give satisfaction to one, and perhaps many of your readers. G. W. C.

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

[The Editor believing that the following correspondence may be useful, and being strengthened in that belief by the opinion of some of his friends, has concluded to insert it in the Herald of Truth. The parties live, one in Europe and one in the United States. The subject of these letters is the New Jerusalem Church. The gentleman in Europe writes strongly in opposition, the one in America in favor. And considerable talent is discoverable on both sides. The writer in opposition, at any rate, has a wonderful faculty of giving a most disadvantageous view of what he wishes to condemn; and resembles the painter who endeavors to draw the attention of the beholder, from the deficiency of the likeness, by the strength of the colours. Did the members of the New Church consider marriage in the light that this writer appears to, and indeed I believe I may say, in the light that the old church generally do; they would not only deny its existence hereafter, but would be unable to entertain a very exalted opinion of it even here. Indeed, what this writer would call marriage, the members of the New Church would not consider as deserving the name, any more than they would consider the material bodies of men without souls, as real true and living men. But those who believe in the resurrection of the material bodies of men and women in perfect form, ought in order to be consistent to believe in natural or external marriages hereafter, and also in a material heaven.

All true marriages originate from the union of Divine love and Divine wisdom in the Lord.—These heavenly principles flow from him into the human soul. The Divine love more particularly into the souls or minds of women, and the Divine wisdom more particularly into the minds of men. These principles existing in God in perfect union, seek to be united also in human souls. This is the true origin of true marriage. And no persons can in reality be married, unless their marriage be produced by the union of those heavenly principles within them.]

DEAR SIR—I doubt I have in writing on the doctrine of the N. Church, expressed myself in a way not quite agreeable to you, as I have not heard from you since my letter on that subject. I certainly have in some degree attended to the recommendation in your long letter of May, 1824. For I hardly think that any peculiar system of religion has occupied so much of my attention at any time. I do not mean here to include divine revelation and the study of the bible. There is something in Swedenborgianism that commands our attention, and seems to require a thorough investigation,—besides peculiar circumstances in regard to myself personally. I read Hindmarsh—it is an ingeniously written book. The last I read was the 1st volume of the Arcana Cœlestia, being an exposition according to the internal sense of the first nine chapters in Genesis. Although I differ from you and those who receive the Baron's writings with the authority they claim, you get quit of the objection by saying, "O you take the literal sense, but there is an internal and celestial sense which is the spirit of the bible; it is it we receive." Now there is hardly any answering this argument. One test, however, I think you cannot object to; that is, whether the Baron is consistent with himself. Now I found in almost innumerable instances, particularly in the Arcana Cœlestia, and I am satisfied were I to study further I would find more, and some deeply affecting the truths of the doctrines, and authority claimed—of actual contradictions and inconsistencies. For instance, in explaining the meaning of the expression, "tree good for fruit," he says somewhere,

I think about No. 100, that this expression means the perception of truth. Again, where the same expression occurs a few leaves after, and without any variation of application in the bible, the Baron gives, as he does of almost every expression, the meaning, and without adverting to his former definition, he says, tree good for food means lust. In explaining the meaning of the garden of Eden, in one place he says, garden means what relates to the spiritual man, and Eden all things relating to the celestial man. In another part, the same expression occurring (I think about 122, 123, but I have not the book by me,) he says, garden of Eden means all things relating to the celestial man, and by the subsequent number seems intentionally to exclude the spiritual man. When he first explains garden of Eden he makes a quotation from Isaiah, the interpretation of which is quite discordant with the spirit or language of scripture, or I may say with common sense. But I am aware this is not argument; yet contradictions and inconsistencies are certainly good arguments, and if you will pay a little critical attention to the writings, you will find that they abound with these, and in a very palpable manner.

After bestowing so much attention on reading at least a part of these works and examining them, you will, I dare say, readily excuse my expressing myself freely on the subject. And, however much you are or have been attached to the writings, I am satisfied that you will give a candid perusal to my letter.—I admit there are things not only moral, but very striking. The devil has long made war against the interests of our Saviour, by endeavoring to persuade that he was merely human; now may not he go to the other extreme. By a show of great piety and deep interest about matters of religion, he may succeed in obtaining a footing for some one error or delusion. The advantages that seem to arise from a reception of Swedenborg—I mean to the interests of the devil and those concerned in the opposition of truth, are many. 1st. According to him almost all idolaters and heathens are saved, and taken to the highest heaven, while hardly any who profess christianity are,—then why make any exertions for enlightening and evangelizing the world. Far better to let them remain in ignorance and darkness, although in opposition to the commandments of our Saviour: "Go teach all nations," &c. 2ndly. The heavenly or spiritual state is, according to him, a state of sensual enjoyment. They live in the married state there. I have not read the work you recommended on conjugial love, but it is evident that Swedenborg in many places refers to and describes the sexual connexion as existing in heaven, although he may in other places talk about the marriage of love and truth. Thus, as from Hindmarsh's book, he describes about dutchmen and their wives and others who had quarrelled, or the wife,assumed, superiority over her husband in this world, and the principle remained after they went to heaven, but was got eradicated, and then they lived together happily as man and wife, &c. where exactly the same kind of connubial connexion is described

as in this world. Now there can be nothing more express than the declaration of our Saviour on this head—on a case I think figured and better adapted for bringing the point to a decision, viz: one woman having had seven husbands successively. The spirituality of heavenly exercise, which we are called to look forward to and cultivate, and which a great part of religion consists in, is very different in my humble view from any such a system as that laid down by the Baron. 4. Here is a strange tautology regarding faith and love. He often mentions them, particularly love, as the principle from which our obedience is due or flows. Now, I conceive these to be merely of the nature of commandments—and they are by our Saviour and the sacred writers expressly mentioned as commandments. The principle of our obedience clearly, I think, is laid down, to be the fear of God, according to the very quotations you make in your letter to Mr. ——: "fear God and keep his commandments; this is the whole duty of man."—The distinction may perhaps not appear to you material, but on considering it a little, I think you will see it to be of great importance. 5th. I think as far as I can understand what the Baron says about influx, such as this: all the good we do or think is by immediate influx from God. Now this destroys the whole system of free agency and moral accountability But I have not room to enlarge; and to sit down to oppose the contradictions and absurdities in these writings would be to begin a volume. Pardon me, my dear sir, for writing so plainly. Now if the evil one can establish a delusion in any one error, say the denial of the divinity of our Saviour, or any of the above; how much zeal and pious pretensions would he sacrifice, but such a cloud of them as are in Swedenborg's writings are worth an age of labour to him, if they were, which it would seem they are to some extent, getting a footing and belief in. But I must conclude for want of room. I hope you will pardon my freedom, and I wish to be favored with a letter from you soon, on this subject, which, as first taken up by you, I hope you will not desert, or find fault with my differing in opinion from you.

I am, dear Sir, &c.

September 12th, 1825.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE.

Dear Sir—Towards the end of the week before last, your letter dated the 18th of July with a few lines from my friend Mr. ——— came to hand. So many are your misapprehensions of the doctrines of the New Church that any attempts on my part to remove them appeared at first to be entirely fruitless: but as you conclude your letter with a wish for an answer to it, and a hope that I will not desert you or find fault with your differing from me, I have concluded upon a

compliance with your wish. I beg leave in the first place to recommend to you, to prostrate yourself before the almighty Lord, the author and giver of life and light, the only true light, that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world and to beseech him to enlighten you, remembering that whosoever followeth Him shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. I would also mention that his holy word is the fountain of light both to angels and men The word of Jehovah is written in the Heavens. *There* it is comprehended according to its spiritual and celestial senses. The natural sense is for mankind, who are in a natural state, but of which sense the internal may be disclosed in a certain degree to those who are sincerely desirous of receiving it. The best and only ground for this reception, is the acknowledgment and worship of Him whom all the angels adore, with the most profound reverence, and a life according to his divine precepts which are summarily declared in the decalogue, the substance of which you know is to love the truth with all our hearts and our neighbours as ourselves. It is a tenet of the New Church that the angels, especially those of the third heaven, love each other more and better than themselves. Whilst you have thought proper to introduce the *evil one* into your letter as having changed his plan of seducing mankind, assuming now a show of great piety and going to the extreme of persuading them to believe in the sole and absolute divinity of our blessed Saviour, you seem to have forgotten what one of the Apostles says of this great deceiver under the name of anti-Christ—that he is a liar and the truth is not in him. At all events you will not deny this proceeding would be to contradict his own essence or nature. It would be truly extraordinary for such a being (if a devil can be so denominated) to change itself into an angel of light and become an advocate of real goodness and truth, love and wisdom with their fruits of holiness and righteousness, in order that those whom he is even intent to lead captive at his own will may cast off their servile chains of evil and falsehood and become as the angels of heaven, by the love of the Lord and of their neighbour. The contrary of this position is laid down by our blessed Saviour, and it is further evident from various parts of the Word "*Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the Leopard his spots.*"

But as a single sheet will not admit of many remarks on this subject, I proceed with a few brief notes in answer to the objections contained in your letter. In my former letter I referred you to some of the writings of Swedenborg for information of the doctrines of the New Church, which though new, are in substance nothing more than an exposition of the genuine sense of the holy word, its sacred contents have not hitherto been fully made known, because mankind in *general* were unable to understand and receive them in their purity. Yet I am inclined to think that there have been some virtuous and pious minds in all ages, even the darkest, that have been convinced of that grand and fundamental truth of the New Church, viz: the sole

divinity of Jesus Christ. Many of the prayers in the Romish ritual are addressed to him alone, some of these have been transferred into the liturgies of the Protestants, whilst many others have addressed their supplications to him as the only wise God their Saviour.

Not having kept a copy of my former letter to you, dated in May 1824, I do not recollect more of its contents, than requesting you to read the introduction to the treatise on conjugial love, where you would find the sense of the passage to which you had referred in your former letter to me, "of there being no marriages in Heaven." Should the remarks on your objections seem at first perusal difficult of comprehension or written in too free a style, you will have the goodness to extend that pardon which you were polite enough to claim in your own behalf, and to examine the subject more fully than you appear yet to have done. Your most prominent objections to the doctrines of the New Church, or rather the exposition of Baron Swedenborg, of the internal sense of the bible, is founded on their inconsistency and what you have been pleased to call palpable incoherency as one instance of this, you quote the different explanations of the words "Tree good for fruit." Had you carefully considered those explanations in their connection with the states of the most ancient church, its rise, progress, meridian splendor, and successive declension from purity to its opposite, you might at least have formed a different conclusion and discovered a beautiful harmony in the whole. No. 81, Arcana Cœlestia begins with declaring that the subject of the 2d chapter of Genesis treats of the celestial man, or of one who believes and *perceives* essential and celestial goodness and truth and does not acknowledge any other faith than that grounded in love: this subject continues until the 17th verse. The 18th begins with the fall of man from celestial order whereby his perceptions became perverted, and instead of being from the divine illumination, were from his own proprium or self-hood, and thus sensual and scientific. Thus a total perversion of divine things took place in his mind.—A. C. 191. In this state they began to believe nothing which they could not conceive with their senses by reason of self-love or proprium The fulness of this declension is described in the 3d chapter. Thus they put darkness for light, and light for darkness, good for evil, and evil for good: consequently those things by which they were surrounded became changed in their perception, and thus that which was seen before as good for food, or tending to the nourishment and salvation of the soul was now beheld as merely sensual or scientific and was no otherwise desired than from self-love.

The distinction between the chapters as having reference to different states of the most ancient church should therefore be attended to, and we will then perceive that the contradiction or want of harmony is not in the exposition given by Swedenborg, but in man's fallen state. Hence, when he says, 'Tree good for food" signifies lust, he prepares you for a different application; because he informs you that a differ-

ence of state occurred in man whereby he receded from Paradise or intelligence grounded in heavenly perception and became sensual and corporeal, seeing all things in the light of self-love. Now this shows the consistency and harmony of the science of correspondences, in that it keeps up its application to states of life, however these may vary. What is evil but perverted good, or the false but perverted truth? For evil and false could have no original creation, they could not have proceeded from a God of love and wisdom. Man then by receding from a celestial state became changed in his internal love, and what was good became evil or lust. Thus to eat and drink is good when man perceives Providence in his means of gratifying his appetite and does it in proper order. But when he acts contrary, a lawful good becomes an unlawful fleshly lust, or concupiscence. Frequent instances of this apparent want of harmony occur in Swedenborg.—For instance Sun signifies love and charity, and moon signifies faith. Sun also signifies evil, and moon the false. But the context shews how they are to be taken in a different relation; when the sun is genial and reviving it means love, when darkened, scorching, &c. it means evil So the the moon rising in her beauty represents faith, when changing, &c. the false. Thus also stone signifies truth as when the Lord is said to be the foundation of the church, &c. but it also signifies error, as when he pointed to the temple corresponding with the Jewish church, which was to be destroyed, declared that no one stone was to be left upon another.

These remarks apply likewise to the apparent difference in the signification of the garden of Eden. Thus, also, the term God, generally used to signify the great Jehovah, is sometimes used to signify an idol, or any thing the wicked love supremely. Son of man, in a good sense, means the divine truth of the word, but in another sense it means the opposite false as in the 146th Psalm: "Put not your trust in princes or in the sons of men," &c. This refers to the falses and evil principles which arise from the loves of self and of the world, and consequently are in opposition to God. But having dwelt long enough on this important subject for a letter, I proceed to make a few remarks on your other objections. 2d. The devil, as you state, having hitherto advocated the mere humanity of our Saviour, you seem to think it probable he now may have taken the other side, viz: to advocate his mere or absolute divinity. In addition to what has been before observed on this extrordinary change of nature you thereby must admit that the devil (by which term is represented the infernal influence of evil spirits) is now in the right Permit me then to ask if our Lord is not wholly and essentially divine? If you venture to say his body (which notwithstanding all professing christians acknowledge to be glorious or glorified i. e. divine) is not divine, then be pleased to say whether that body be alive or not.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]